

REMARKS

In the Office Action, dated February 4, 2003, the Examiner states that Claims 1-4 are pending, Claims 1-9 and 11-14 are rejected, and Claim 10 is withdrawn from consideration. By the present Amendment, Applicant amends the claims.

In the Office Action, Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite for insufficient antecedent basis for limitations within the claim. The Applicant has amended Claim 1 to provide sufficient antecedent basis.

Claims 1-9 and 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Thomas et al (WO 93/24243). The Applicant respectfully disagrees with and traverses this rejection.

Thomas discloses a silicon oxide film which is similar to the silicon oxide film claimed in the present application. However, Thomas only discloses the silicon oxide film obtained by using the specific apparatus in Figure 1 of Thomas. A differing manufacturing process and apparatus will form a silicon oxide film having differing densities and structure, which affects the gas barrier properties of the film. Therefore, two silicon oxide films having the same composition do not necessarily have the same gas barrier properties.

The silicon oxide film that Thomas discloses and which is claimed in the present application have a similar composition, but different densities and structures. As such, the properties between the two, such as IR absorption, refractive index, distance between grains, etc., also differ.

Since the resulting silicon oxide film which is claimed in the present invention is different from what is disclosed by Thomas, and Thomas does not teach, suggest or disclose a silicon oxide film having density and structure as claimed, the Applicant considers the rejection overcome.

Claims 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Thomas in view of Koji et al. (JP 4210464). The Applicant considers these dependent claims to be patentable for the same reasons recited above.

3

In light of the foregoing response, all the outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome. Applicant respectfully submits that this application should now be in better condition for allowance and respectfully requests favorable consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

July 29, 2003
Date


Attorney for Applicant
Brian W. Hameder
c/o Ladas & Parry
224 South Michigan Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60604
(312) 427-1300
Reg. No. 45613

FILED
JUL 30 2003
GROUP 1700